

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-8, 18, 19, and 24-26 are pending in the application, with 1, 6, 18 and 24 being the independent claims. Claim 18 has been amended to correct a typographical error. No further amendments to the claims or specification have been made in this Reply. Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

***Examiner Interview***

Applicant's representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended during the April 7, 2005 interview. As noted in the Interview Summary, Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed the Gellert '164 patent in view of the pending claims, in particular, the recitations in the claims regarding the temperature sensor/thermocouple. The advantages of the claimed features are discussed in more detail below.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1-8, 18, 19, and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,771,164 to Gellert. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claims 1 and 6 recite that the heater and temperature sensor are embedded within the nozzle for substantially the entire length each is wrapped around the nozzle. The Examiner acknowledges that the Gellert '164 patent does *not* disclose that the thermocouple 92 is embedded within the nozzle for substantially the entire

length it is wrapped around the nozzle, but states that "[e]mbedding the thermocouple wire element the entire length of the nozzle would have been obvious since it is known to embed the heater wire the entire length of the nozzle." Office Action at page 2. The Examiner inquired at the interview regarding the advantages of embedding the thermocouple in the nozzle. The advantages are that size of the cutout required by the nozzle is reduced because the overall diameter of the nozzle and the thermocouple is reduced. This reduces the pitch necessary between nozzles. Further, embedding the thermocouple within the nozzle more securely maintains the thermocouple position such that it is less likely to move during operations. Accordingly, embedding the thermocouple in the nozzle would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the Gellert '164 patent. Claims 2-5 and 7-8 depend from and add features to independent claims 1 and 6, respectively, and are therefore patentable over the Gellert '164 patent for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 6.

Similarly, independent claim 18 recites that the electric heater and temperature sensor are substantially equidistant from a centerline of the melt channel from a first portion adjacent the manifold to a tip portion adjacent the mold cavity. The Gellert '164 patent does not disclose this feature, as the thermocouple 92 is farther away from the centerline of the melt channel than the electric heater wire 82 for substantially the entire length from a first portion adjacent the manifold to a tip portion adjacent the mold cavity. The advantages discussed above with respect to independent claims 1 and 6 apply equally to the invention recited in independent claim 18. Claim 19 depends from claim 18 and is patentable over the Gellert '164 patent for at least the same reasons discussed above.

Independent claim 24 recites that the thermocouple wire element is embedded within an insulating layer for substantially the entire length the thermocouple wire element is wound spirally around the nozzle body. As discussed above, the Gellert '164 patent does not disclose or suggest this feature. Claims 25 and 26 depend from and add features to independent claim 24 and are patentable over the Gellert '164 patent for at least the same reasons as claim 24.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Albert L. Ferro  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 44,679

Date: May 16, 2005

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600

399217\_1.DOC